



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                    | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/580,219                         | 06/28/2006  | Krister Hansson      | TPP 32005           | 9825             |
| 24257                              | 7590        | 09/28/2007           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| STEVENS DAVIS MILLER & MOSHER, LLP |             |                      | TOLIN, MICHAEL A    |                  |
| 1615 L STREET, NW                  |             |                      | ART UNIT            |                  |
| SUITE 850                          |             |                      | PAPER NUMBER        |                  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20036               |             |                      | 1733                |                  |
| MAIL DATE                          |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 09/28/2007                         |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                              |                  |                |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |
|                              | 10/580,219       | HANSSON ET AL. |
|                              | Examiner         | Art Unit       |
|                              | Michael A. Tolin | 1733           |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 5 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, and 16-20 in the reply filed on 05 July 2007 is acknowledged.

***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 10, 13, 14, and 18-20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claim 10 broadens the Markush group of wear layer resins specified in claim 1 to the species of an "amino resin". Accordingly, claim 10 improperly removes the specific list of amino resins for the wear layer indicated in claim 1. The examiner suggests amending claim 10 to indicate that the thermosetting resin of the wear layer is a high viscosity resin.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 1, it is entirely unclear what is meant by "increases the bonding". More specifically, it is unclear if "the bonding" refers to bond strength and is unclear what the bonding is being compared to. Since the improved bonding appears to be inherent as a result of the amino resin, the Examiner suggests deleting the newly added whereby clause.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-14, and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson (US 6565919) in view of Sano (US 2002/0077384).

Hansson teaches a method of making a decorative laminate comprising the steps of providing a base layer, printing a decorative layer on the base layer, applying a wear layer impregnated with melamine-formaldehyde resin, and bonding layers together in a press with heat and pressure (Abstract; the Figure; column 2, lines 28-46; column 10, lines 2-3; claim 20; column 4, lines 4-14).

Hansson differs from the claim 1 in that Hansson does not teach a printing ink comprising an amino resin, and Hansson does not recite increasing the bonding. It is noted that Hansson prefers inkjet printing, but does not specify particular ink compositions. Accordingly one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to look to the prior art for inkjet ink compositions. Sano teaches ink compositions for inkjet printing which possess excellent printing stability, ejection stability, storage stability, and color reproduction (Abstract). Sano's ink composition includes, among other components, a resin. Among the preferred resins are amino compounds, such as melamine resin, melamine-formaldehyde resin, amino alkyd co-condensation resin, and urea resin (paragraph 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to provide Hansson with a printing ink comprising an amino resin because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide Hansson with an inkjet ink having excellent printing stability, ejection stability, storage stability, and color reproduction in accordance with the teachings of Sano.

Regarding the claimed improvement in bonding, as noted above in the 35 USC 112 rejection, is entirely unclear what the improvement in bonding is being compared to. The specification does explain at the bottom of page 1 to the top of page 2 that improved bonding results from the presence of amino resin mixed into the printing ink. Sano clearly suggests an ink composition having amino resin mixed therein. Since Sano teaches substantially the same composition as the claim, it can reasonably be expected that the claimed improvement in bonding is inherent in the use of an ink composition comprising amino resin in accordance with the teachings of Sano. To the

extent that the claimed improvement in bonding requires the presence of some other resin, Sano does teach providing an additional resin (paragraph 63).

Regarding claim 2, Sano teaches amino alkyd co-condensation resin (paragraph 48). Such a resin satisfies both the claimed limitation of an amino resin and limitation of an alkyd based ink. To the extent that claim 2 requires distinct amino and alkyd resin components, Sano teaches an alkyd resin (paragraph 48) in combination with a preferred additional resin selected from a relatively short list of resins which includes several amino resins (paragraph 63).

Regarding claim 4, among the resins taught by Sano is melamine-formaldehyde resin, and Sano desires resins having a molecular weight in the range of 3000 to 50,000 (paragraphs 44, 48). A melamine formaldehyde resin with a molecular weight in this range includes the connection of melamine units by ether linkages, thus satisfying the claimed etherified amino resin.

Hansson clearly teaches or suggests the limitations of claims 6, 7, 10-14, 16-20 (column 2, lines 53-60; Abstract; claim 20; column 3, lines 54-67; column 4, lines 1-4).

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansson in view of Sano as applied to claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10-14, and 16-20 above, and further in view of Schulz (US 2003/0039810)..

Hansson teaches that it is advantageous to print the upper side of the core after the core is provided with edges intended for joining in order to reduce waste and improve matching tolerances (column 1, lines 60-63; column 2, lines 53-60). Hansson

differs from the claims in that Hansson prepares the core for printing by sanding and priming rather than by bonding a paper layer to the core prior to printing (column 10, lines 1-3). While Hansson provides a suitable surface by sanding and priming, it is generally well known in the art of decorative laminates to provide a paper layer as a suitable surface for printing. For example, Schulz teaches a paper layer suitable for inkjet printing and incorporation into decorative laminates (Abstract; paragraphs 1-5, 12-14, and 20). Schulz teaches that the paper provides good printing properties, low ink consumption, good image definition, and high color density (paragraph 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a paper layer for receiving the printing in Hansson because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to achieve good printing properties, low ink consumption, good image definition, and high color density in accordance with the teachings of Schulz. Regarding the limitation of bonding the base layer prior to printing, this is the expected manner of using the method of Hansson as modified by Schulz because Hansson teaches printing on the upper side of the core as part of a process to reduce waste and improve matching tolerances, as noted above. As to the limitation of bonding the base layer, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been expected to appreciate that the base layer cannot be merely laid down on the core or it could become easily displaced before or during the printing operation. Bonding is well known as a means of attaching a flexible material to a base so that the flexible material stays in a desired orientation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to bond the paper layer to the core because one of ordinary skill in

the art would have been motivated to use any well known suitable method for attaching the paper to the core in order to avoid the paper becoming displaced before or during the printing operation.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4, 6-14, and 16-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Michael A. Tolin whose telephone number is 571-272-8633. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am to 5:30pm.**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on 571-272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Michael A. Tolin



JEFF H. AFTERGUT  
PRIMARY EXAMINEE  
GROUP 1300